

ATTN COM 55701

1. UJROSKY/UDREK/BALLET - PLANNED over additional information re the upcoming Berlin meeting - See MUMI 6090.
2. BARANS/Ops Leads Provided by GIVROSKY - See EIMA-55701/colony.

3. UJROSKY/Overseas Surveillance - [ ] said he had discussed this subject as a training and that an effort would be made to lay on surveillance in Germany for several weeks. [ ] said he was optimistic that this would be a very productive effort, that he could see some coverage to pick up UJROSKY should he go to Austria, but that we might at least be able to pick up any interesting visitors and get a better reading of the pattern of activity in the house. [ ] also mentioned that we were hoping, at least, to be able to lay on an illegal entry into UJROSKY's house circa mid-September.

7. UJROSKY/Overseas Surveillance - [ ] said he had discussed this subject as a training and that an effort would be made to lay on surveillance in Germany for several weeks. [ ] said he was optimistic that this would be a very productive effort, that he could see some coverage to pick up UJROSKY should he go to Austria, but that we might at least be able to pick up any interesting visitors and get a better reading of the pattern of activity in the house. [ ] also mentioned that we were hoping, at least, to be able to lay on an illegal entry into UJROSKY's house circa mid-September.

ATTC

ECMA-55701

1 AUG 1961

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2. See SCHLOCKERMAN - [redacted] about [redacted] which [redacted] [redacted] as being of ops interest to UJDROWSY and FLEMING said he had [redacted] the [redacted] data.

3. BANANE/MICROFIL Address - See MUNI 6562. On the [redacted] of MICROFIL, FLEMING said he had been unable to locate a copy of [redacted] per Yellow No. 22074 dated 3 November 1960, and requested a copy.

4. UJDROWSY Home in Germany - FLEMING said he still felt one of the main [redacted] for getting evidence against UJDROWSY was surveillance entry of his home. [redacted] [redacted] that it appeared from the intercepts that the house would be occupied throughout the summer and that it most probably would not be possible to attempt surreptitious entry until circa mid-September at the earliest.

ATT. A to ECMA 55701 1 AUG 1961 ↑

ATT. B to ECMA 55701 1 AUG 1961 ↓

5. UJDROWSY Telephone Conversation - [redacted] [redacted] called FLEMING's attention to an intercept indicating that UJDROWSY's Aunt Loni, from [redacted] was [redacted] [redacted] Germany in the near future. Holderness also noted that the conversation [redacted] Aunt "Martl", who also appeared to be in the States, and wondered if it was possible that it was Aunt "Martl" who had provided the sum of money that UJDROWSY had talked up as having come from an aunt in the States. FLEMING said he was certain UPHILL had no record that UJDROWSY had a second aunt in the U. S.

6. SCHLOCKERMAN/FRASCH/BERGMANN - Traces requested per a [redacted] request from FLEMING - See MUNI 6638.

7. UJDROWSY/UJDROW/BANANE - FLEMING said he wanted to have the tape of a conversation between UJDROWSY and UJDROW concerning the BANANE operation. FLEMING said he found it odd that UJDROWSY seemed to be taking down the operation and compiling the story how expensive it was, particularly in terms of UJDROW's frequent travel to Berlin. FLEMING said the only explanation he could offer was that UJDROWSY had wind of the fact that STURM was keeping a close eye on the operation. FLEMING added that STURM had had to ask FREIMER a number of questions about the operation in order to elicit background information in connection with the surveillance coverage in Berlin. FLEMING said that after further checking on the operation he was convinced BANANE had been controlled by the MRS from the start. [redacted] gave FLEMING a copy of Yellow No. 22074 dated 3 November 1960 containing KUBARK traces on BANANE. [redacted] said one thing he did not understand was how the operation could have been started in the first place or later taken seriously in view of the derogatory information we had provided. FLEMING then said that one reason might be that very few people were aware of our derogatory information; he said that our memo was the only document missing from the otherwise complete UPHILL headquarters case file and that all efforts to locate the document had failed.